

PAUL IZOR,
Plaintiff,
v.
ABACUS DATA SYSTEMS, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. [19-cv-01057-HSG](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART MOTION FOR AN
ORDER TEMPORARILY STAYING
CASE DEADLINES, DENYING
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR
REFERRED, AND DENYING AS
MOOT MOTION TO EXPEDITE**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 53, 54, 55

Defendant moved the Court to stay the case “until the Supreme Court decides the constitutionality of the TCPA in Barr v. American Association of Political Consultants Inc., 19-631.” Dkt. No. 50. Given the case schedule and other approaching deadlines, this motion was accompanied by a flurry of administrative motions, which the Court addresses in this Order.

The Court **GRANTS IN PART** and **DENIES IN PART** Defendant’s motion for an order amending the scheduling order or temporarily staying case deadlines. Dkt. No. 54. The parties are directed to proceed with the previously-coordinated March 3, 2020 Rule 30(b)(6) deposition. The Court reminds Defendant that it has no authority to unilaterally decline to participate in discovery absent an order. The Court will otherwise stay the remaining case deadlines until the Court resolves Defendant’s motion to stay.

The Court further **DENIES** Plaintiff’s administrative motion for referral to a magistrate judge for discovery purposes. Dkt. No. 53. The issues raised by Plaintiff’s motion are not discovery disputes: they are substantive case management issues related to the motion to stay. The parties are directed to proceed as outlined above.

//

//

1 Finally, the Court **DENIES AS MOOT** Defendant's motion to expedite the hearing on the
2 motion for an order amending the scheduling order to stay case deadlines. Dkt. No. 55. This
3 Order resolves the motion and the Court does not need further briefing or a hearing.

4

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: 3/2/2020

7 
8 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
9 United States District Judge

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28